Remarks

The following remarks are intended to be fully responsive to the Final Office Action mailed November 11, 2006:

Claims 1, 4-6, 13, 16, and 24-25 are pending. Claims 1, 5-6, 13, and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by Ishida et al. (U.S. 6,312,159) in view of Belsanti (U.S. 4,398,507). Claims 4 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishida in view of Belsanti and further in view of Patchen et al. (U.S. 3,739,657).

Claims Rejection: §103(a) – Claims 1, 5-6, 13, and 24-25

Claims 1, 5-6, 13, and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by Ishida et al. in view of Belsanti.

For a rejection to be proper under 36 U.S.C. §102(b), every element and limitation found in the rejected claim must be found in the reference. "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). (emphasis added). See MPEP §2131.

With respect to **claim 1**, the Examiner states, "Ishida does not disclose the squirt hole having a first and second bore. Nor the first end of the first bore having a first diameter, and the second bore having a second end with a second diameter, and the second diameter being greater than the first diameter. Belsanti shows in Figure 2 a oil squirt hole with a first (34) and second (33) bore. The second bore (33) has a larger diameter than the first bore (34)."

However, claim 1 recites limitations of a squirt hole formed in a crank arm bore end". Figures 1 and 2 of Belsanti show the orifice (34) of that invention being formed in the pin bore end, and not the crank arm bore end as required by claim 1. Specifically, claim 1 recites in part, "a connecting rod body having a pin bore formed in one end and a crank arm bore formed in an opposite end, wherein said opposite end has a squirt hole formed therethrough." (emphasis added). Belsanti's orifice (34) is not "formed in a crank arm bore end" as required by claim 1, but rather a "wrist pin end 10". See Belsanti, column 2, lines 25-33.

Additionally, orifice (34) of Belsanti as shown in Figure 2 does not have a first and second bore, contrary to the Examiner's indication. The Examiner likens element (33) to a second bore. However, Belsanti discloses that element (33) is a "flared portion (of orifice 34, that) produces an enlarged opening…". In other words, flared portion (33) is a widened opening of orifice (34), but orifice (34), i.e. the "squirt hole" of that invention, is not a two-bore design as required by claim 1.

For clarification, claim 1 is amended herein to further recite "(the) first bore having a uniform first diameter along its length and a…second bore having a uniform second diameter along its length…wherein said uniform second diameter is larger than said first diameter." Support is found at paragraph [0021], and in Figures 1, 2, and 3. Belsanti, since it discloses a flared end of a single orifice, does not teach or suggest a first and second bore, nor does it teach that these two bores each have different uniform diameters. Flared end (33), as shown in Figure 2, is clearly angled, so it has a variable versus a uniform diameter, depending on where the measurement is taken.

Since Ishida et al. in view of Belsanti still does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of amended claim 1, as set forth hereinabove, this claim is believed to be in proper condition for allowance.

With respect to **claims 5-6**, these claims depend from amended claim 1, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

With respect to **claim 13**, this claim is amended herein to recite the uniform first and second diameter limitations discussed previously hereinabove with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, amended claim 13 is believed to be in proper condition for allowance, as Ishida et al. in view of Belsanti still does not teach all of the limitations of amended claim 13, as required for a proper §103(a) rejection.

With respect to **claims 24-25**, these claims ultimately depend from amended claim 1, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims Rejection: §103(a) – Claims 4 and 16

Claims 4 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by Ishida et al. in view of Belsanti and further in view of Patchen. The Examiner cites Patchen for the purpose of showing a burr catcher pocket. However, with respect to claims 4 and 16, these claims depend from amended claims 1 and 13, respectively, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 1 and 13, which recite limitations neither taught nor suggested by Ishida et al and Belsanti, as discussed previously hereinabove. Patchen does not provide the missing limitations, as this reference also does not disclose a two-bore squirt hole having bores of different uniform diameters, as required by amended claims 1 and 13. See element (20) of Figure 1 and the description of this element as "a single continuous passage…". Column 2, line 65. Accordingly, claims 4 and 16 are in proper condition for allowance.

Conclusion

This Amendment is believed to be fully responsive to the Final Office Action mailed November 9, 2006. The amendment and remarks in support of the rejected claim is believed to place this application in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. Please charge any fees associated with this amendment to deposit account 07-0960.

Respectfully submitted,

GEORGE W. FORD, et al.

By
Christopher W. Quinn
Reg. No. 38,274

Date: 1/5/07

QUINN LAW GROUP, PLLC
39555 Orchard Hill Place, Ste. 520
Novi, Michigan 48375
Phone: 248-380-9300

Fax: 248-380-8968

On behalf of:

Christopher DeVries
GENERAL MOTORS CORPORATION
Legal Staff Mail Code 482-C23-B21
P.O. Box 300
Detroit, Michigan 48265-3000